

Case No. 5:21-CV-00107-M

Defendants.

determination of those portions of the report or specified proposed findings or recommendations to which objection is made.” *Id.* § 636(b)(1). “The district court is only required to review de novo those portions of the report to which specific objections have been made, *see* 28 U.S.C.A. §636(b)(1), and need not conduct de novo review ‘when a party makes general and conclusory objections that do not direct the court to a specific error in the magistrate judge’s proposed findings and recommendations.’” *Farmer v. McBride*, 177 F. App’x 327, 330–31 (4th Cir. 2006) (quoting *Orpiano v. Johnson*, 687 F.2d 44, 47 (4th Cir. 1982)). Absent a specific and timely objection, the court reviews only for “clear error” and need not give any explanation for adopting the recommendation. *See Diamond v. Colonial Life & Accident Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005). The applicable June 6, 2022 deadline passed without either party filing objections.

Upon careful review of the M&R and the entire record presented, and finding no clear error, the court ADOPTS the recommendation of the magistrate judge as its own. For the reasons stated therein, Plaintiff’s renewed motion for a default [DE 80] is GRANTED, and a judgment awarding default judgment against Defendants as a sanction will be entered contemporaneously in accordance with this order. Likewise, for the reasons stated in the M&R, Plaintiff’s motion for sanctions and to compel discovery responses [DE 64] is DENIED. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

SO ORDERED this 11th day of July, 2022.


RICHARD E. MYERS II
CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE